

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-7 and 11 are cancelled, claims 8-10 and 12-14 remain in this application as amended herein, and claims 15-20 are added. Accordingly, claims 8-10 and 12-20 are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

Claim 10 has been amended solely to have the claims better conform to the requirements of U.S. practice. None of these amendments is intended to narrow the scope of any of these claims, and no new matter has been added by these amendments.

In the Office Action, the drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). Claims 8 and 14 have been amended to correct the informalities.

Applicants therefore submit that the drawings are in full compliance with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a).

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claim 14 has been amended to correct the informality.

Applicants therefore submit that claim 14 is in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Claims 8-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 8 and 14 have been amended to correct the informalities.

Applicants therefore submit that claims 8-14 are in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Turning now to the art rejections, claims 8, 10, and 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee (U.S. Patent Application Publication

No. 2004/0145584). Applicants submit that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the relied on sections of Lee.

Independent claim 8 has been amended to more clearly show the differences between the claimed features and the relied on art. No new matter has been added by these changes. Support for these changes is found at, e.g., Fig. 3 and pages 18-21 of the specification.

As amended herein, claim 1 recites:

a primary side for receiving said direct current input voltage, and including:

a pair of series connected switches for switching the direct current input voltage to generate an alternating current input voltage supplied to a primary winding of at least one transformer, and

a driving circuit for driving said pair of series connected switches[.]

(Emphasis added.) The relied on sections of Lee neither disclose nor suggest a pair of series connected switches for switching a direct current input voltage to generate an alternating current input voltage. Moreover, the relied on sections of Lee neither disclose nor suggest a driving circuit for driving a pair of series connected switches (for switching a direct current input voltage to generate an alternating current input voltage).

Also, amended claim 1 calls for:

a detection circuit connected in series with only one of the plurality of parallel connected backlights for detecting a voltage supplied to that backlight, and

a feedback section for receiving the detected voltage from said detection circuit, for rectifying the detected voltage, and for supplying the rectified voltage to said driving circuit of said primary side of said second power conversion section,

said driving circuit controlling the quantity of light emitted by the plurality of parallel connected backlights to a constant value based on the rectified

voltage[.]

(Emphasis added.) The relied on sections of Lee neither disclose nor suggest a detection circuit connected in series with only one of a plurality of parallel connected backlights (of a backlight section), and the relied on sections of Lee neither disclose nor suggest a detection circuit ... for detecting a voltage supplied to that backlight. Moreover, the relied on sections of Lee neither disclose nor suggest a feedback section for supplying a rectified voltage (detected by a detection section connected in series with only one of a plurality of parallel connected backlights of a backlight section for detecting a voltage supplied to that backlight and rectified by the feedback section) to a driving circuit of a primary side of a second power conversion section. Further, the relied on sections of Lee neither disclose nor suggest a driving circuit (for driving a pair of series connected switches of a primary side of a second power conversion section for switching a direct current input voltage to generate an alternating current input voltage) controlling the quantity of light emitted by the plurality of parallel connected backlights to a constant value based on a rectified voltage (detected by a detection section connected in series with only one of a plurality of parallel connected backlights of a backlight section for detecting a voltage supplied to that backlight and supplied to the driving circuit).

It follows, for at least these reasons, that the relied on sections of Lee do not disclose or suggest the combination defined in claim 8 and therefore do not anticipate the claim.

Claims 10 and 12-14 depend from claim 8. Therefore, each of these claims is distinguishable over the relied-on sections of Lee for at least the same reasons.

Claims 9 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Lee in view of "the admitted prior art cited by the applicant". Claim 11 is cancelled. Applicants submit that the remaining claim is patentably distinguishable over the relied on sections of the references.

Claim 9 depends from claim 8 and therefore is distinguishable over the relied-on sections of Lee for at least the same reasons.

The relied-on sections of "the admitted prior art cited by the applicant" do not overcome the deficiencies of the relied-on sections of Lee.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the Examiner's objections and the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e), 103(a), 112, first paragraph, and 112, second paragraph.

New independent claim 15 call for features similar to those set out in the above excerpts of claim 8 and therefore is distinguishable over the relied on sections of Lee for at least the reasons set out above regarding claim 8. New claims 16-20 depend from claim 15 and therefore each of these claims is distinguishable over the relied on art for at least the same reasons. Support for new claims 15-20 is analogous to that of claims 8-10 and 12-14, respectively.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: March 8, 2010

Respectfully submitted,  
Electronic signature: /Lawrence  
E. Russ/  
Lawrence E. Russ  
Registration No.: 35,342  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTBENBERG,  
KRMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP  
600 South Avenue West  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
(908) 654-5000  
Attorney for Applicants

11245886\_1.PDF